DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 179 EA 031 501

AUTHOR	Jackson, Barbara L.
TITLE	Exceptional and Innovative Programs in Educational Leadership.
INSTITUTION	University Council for Educational Administration.
SPONS AGENCY	National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Fairfax, VA.; Johnson Foundation, Inc., Racine, WI.
PUB DATE	2001-09-00
NOTE	22p.; Paper commissioned for the Meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (1st, Racine, WI, September 19-21, 2001).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Innovation; *Leadership Training; Program Development; Program Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS	*Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

The history of graduate programs in educational leadership is relatively brief compared to other professional fields and the arts and sciences disciplines. This paper lists criticisms expressed by the National Commission on Excellence in Education Administration (NCEEA) bearing on program deficiencies, such as lack of a definition of good educational leadership and lack of collaboration between school districts and universities. It also lists NCEEA recommendations to all stakeholders involved in education, including having professors collaborate with administrators on reform in curricula for administrator preparation, and having universities fund and staff administrator preparation programs at a level that makes excellence possible. Review topics include patterns and themes of new or revised programs, the knowledge base needed for programs, accreditation standards, and the need for internship and clinical experiences. A series of programs are described--some supported by the Danforth Foundation and others that confer degrees. It would seem that change is taking place in school leadership preparation programs, but some commentators urge caution in assessing the change. Recent changes may be characterized more as incremental rather than dramatic and comprehensive. Points for continued discussion include program knowledge base, clinical experiences (internships), degrees conferred, instructional strategies, students, and faculty. (Contains 34 references.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 461 179

Exceptional and Innovative Programs in Educational Leadership

Barbara L. Jackson, Ph.D.

Paper Commissioned for the first meeting of the
National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation

"Ensuring Universities' Capacity to Prepare Learning Focused Leadership"
Wingspread Conference Center, Racine, Wisconsin
September 19-21, 2001

Sponsored by

University Council for Educational Administration
National Policy Board for Educational Administration
and
The Johnson Foundation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.L. Willis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CS 031 501

Preface

The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, sponsored by the University Council Educational Administration (UCEA), issued its report and recommendations in 1987, bringing national attention to the needs and concerns of educational leaders and, in particular, the preparation programs for these critical positions in America.

In the intervening years, many reforms have been instituted while the social, economic, and political context in which schools operate has continued to change, calling for more action. Recognizing the need to commit to a collaborative effort to improve educational leadership and its preparation programs, UCEA has convened a new Commission to address the needs of the 21st century.

This paper is one of six commissioned by UCEA to focus on the issues to be discussed at the Wingspread Conference, September 19-21, 2001. A selected number of new and revised programs are described, based on the reports available at the present time. Many more programs are in operation, reflecting new approaches to the preparation of educational leaders.

The paper ends with a series of issues, which emerged from the programs that will serve as discussion points at the Conference.

I want to express appreciation to two of my colleagues, Dr. Bruce Cooper and Dr. Lance Fusarelli, for their helpful comments on drafts of this paper.

Barbara L. Jackson

Exceptional and Innovative Programs in Educational Leadership

Introduction

Graduate programs in Educational Leadership have had a relatively brief history, compared to other professional fields and the arts and sciences disciplines. According to the review by McCarthy in the second edition of the *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (1999), preparation programs have evolved in the 20th century, responding to external factors as well as the changing roles of educational leaders - both principals and superintendents. During the reforms of the 80's, the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) sponsored the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). The report and recommendations brought national attention to the needs and concerns of educational leaders, especially their preparation programs.

In Leaders for America's Schools, the National Commission criticized preparation programs for the following deficiencies:

-lack of a definition of good educational leadership
-lack of leader recruitment programs in the schools
-lack of collaboration between school districts and universities
-the discouraging lack of minorities and women in the field
-lack of systematic professional development for school administrators
-lack of quality candidates for preparation programs
-lack of preparation programs relevant to the job demands of school administrators
-lack of sequence, modern content, and clinical experience in preparation programs
-lack of licensure systems that promote excellence
-lack of a national sense of cooperation in preparing school leaders

The Commission addressed its recommendations to all the stakeholders involved in education: public schools; professional organizations; universities; state policymakers; federal policymakers; and the Private Sector (pp. 9-29). For the purposes of this paper, the recommendations for Universities were the most relevant, and included:

-Administrator preparation programs should be like those in professional schools that emphasize theoretical and clinical knowledge, applied research, and supervised practice;
-The position of educational administration program chairperson should be one of leadership with responsibility for program development and renewal;
-Professors should collaborate with administrators on reform in curricula for administrator preparation;
-The faculty of administrator preparation programs should have varied academic backgrounds and experience;
-Professional development should be included in the performance reviews of professors;
-Universities should fund and staff administrator preparation programs at a level that makes excellence possible
-The reward structure for professors should be changed to recognize curriculum reform, instructional innovation, and other activities in addition to traditional scholarship;
-Universities should provide scholarships and other incentives to recruit able students, particularly those from ethnic minority groups;

-Universities unable to accept the spirit of excellence described in this report should cease preparing administrators.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration

A major recommendation of the Commission was to establish a National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), which would be representative of the major professional organizations in the field. The Board, established in 1989, was charged with monitoring the implementation of the Commission's recommendations. The members include American Association of School Administrators (AASA), National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA); National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), and the National School Boards Association (NSBA).

One of the first major projects of the National Policy Board was to establish a Study Group with representation from its member organizations to develop new Curriculum Guidelines for NCATE accreditation for preparation programs for educational leaders. These Guidelines (Standards) are detailed in the following sections since they continue to have an impact on the definition of the Knowledge Base.

After the Commission's Report, UCEA continued to provide leadership for the member institutions to urge implementation of the recommendations. Many universities did undertake self-examination of their preparation programs. The Danforth Foundation, along with other Foundations, provided funds to assist in the development of new approaches that would respond to the stated deficiencies and the recommendations of the Commission. Examples of a selected number of these programs are described along with the themes that were emphasized across programs.

Patterns and Themes of New or Revised Programs

The issues addressed by universities were not necessarily new but took on new emphases as programs were reviewed in attempting to respond to the deficiencies as outlined by the Commission and the external forces pressing on all segments of education. In some areas, these external forces had intensified as a result of the reform movement that began with A Nation at Risk in 1983. McCarthy (1999) described some of these forces as "interests and activities of professional organizations and state and federal government, economic cycles, and other societal developments" (p. 119). The most significant government influence has been through state licensure mandates. Several of the professional organizations have sponsored programs for improvement of preparation - more as in-service academies than preservice. Foundations, especially the Danforth Foundation, have provided funds to plan and implement many of the new or revised programs. A full description of many of the Danforth programs can be found in Milstein (1993), Changing the Way We Prepare Educational Leaders. The major issues that emerged in the new or revised preparation programs for educational leaders are:

-Knowledge Base
-Clinical Experience (Internships)
-Degrees (Masters, EdD, Ph.D.)

-Instructional Strategies (cohort groups; problem-based learning, issues of equity and social justice, technology)
-Students (recruitment, quality)
-Faculty (academic, practitioner)

Each of these will be described with examples of programs, which illustrate how the topics are addressed. A summary of how these have addressed both the deficiencies and recommendations will conclude the paper.

Knowledge Base

This topic has been the most discussed of any phase of preparation programs. The controversy has raged for years leading to many reports and papers including a book edited by Domnoyer, Imber, and Scheurich, The Knowledge Base in Educational Administration: Multiple Perspectives (1995). To demonstrate the continuing relevance of the topic is the prominent position of the topic, "The Continuing Quest for a Knowledge Base: 1976-1998" by Donmoyer in the *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, 2nd edition (1999).

The reason for this interest is that the knowledge base represents the core content of preparation programs - what is it that educational leaders need to know to perform their leadership role in the schools and other institutions? Scheurich (1985) describes the function of a knowledge base.

> The external function of a knowledge base is to prove to those outside the profession that there exists a body of specialized knowledge and skills, the mastery of which confers special status on its practitioners ...Within educational administration, a knowledge base is the core knowledge, or the canon, that every member of the profession should know. (pp. 17-18).

If one accepts this major external function, it is understandable that those in the profession must agree to the components of the knowledge base. To define the knowledge base, the program designers need to understand the nature of knowledge and the way in which knowledge is transmitted. It raises the question of the appropriate role of the academic or discipline knowledge (known for many years as the social science approach) in contrast to practical knowledge, which is learned in the field. Questions of sequence and coherence of courses are raised as faculty and students try to translate the knowledge base into a program of study. The knowledge base will influence the program for Masters degrees and the two doctoral degree programs - doctor of education and the doctor of philosophy - both of which are still offered in many universities.

Several efforts have been undertaken to define the knowledge base in the years since the publication of the Commission Report in 1987. UCEA "began a 10-year effort to identify the knowledge essential for school leaders to solve critical contemporary problems of practice" (quoted in Donmoyer, 1999, p. 30). Seven general categories were suggested as a frame for discussion of a knowledge base: The pedagogical materials based on these categories were developed by a series of task forces appointed by UCEA and published as PRIMIS by McGraw Hill. Complications from the arrangements with the publishing company forced the discontinuation of the series.

NCATE Standards

More significant for today's world, however, is the work completed by a work force appointed by the National Policy Board to Develop Curriculum Guidelines for accreditation by NCATE. Representatives of the member organizations completed this work in 1995 with implementation in 1997. "These standards address 'the knowledge, skills, and attributes' required to lead and manage an educational enterprise centered on teaching and learning" (NPBEA, 1996, p. 6 quoted in Hart & Pounder, 1999, p. 138). Universities seeking new or continued accreditation by NCATE are now required to use these guidelines in preparing their folio for review by the constituent council. Many states are moving toward using this accreditation for their approval of preparation programs.

In developing these guidelines, the group did not separate knowledge or skills by position: i.e., certain skills for principals and another set for superintendents` The academic unit is required to specify which courses, activities, and experiences are provided so that students can meet the standards:

1. Strategic Leadership --The knowledge, skills, and attributes to identify contexts, develop with others vision and purpose, use information, frame problems, exercise leadership processes to achieve common goals, and act ethically for educational communities.

2. Instructional Leadership -- The knowledge, skills, and attributes to design with others appropriate curricula and instructional programs, develop learner-centered school cultures, assess outcomes, provide student personnel services, and plan with faculty professional development activities aimed at improving instruction.

3. Organizational Leadership -- The knowledge, skills, and attributes to understand and improve the organization, implement operational plans, manage financial resources, and apply decentralized management processes and procedures.

4. Political and Community Leadership -- The knowledge, skills, and attributes to act in accordance with legal provisions and statutory requirements, apply regulatory standards, develop and apply appropriate policies, be conscious of ethical implications of policy initiatives and political actions, relate public policy initiatives to student welfare, understand schools as political systems, involve citizens and service agencies, and develop effective staff communications and public relations programs.

5. Internship -- The internship is defined as the process and product that result from the application in a workplace environment of the strategic, instructional, organizational, and contextual leadership guidelines. When coupled with integrating experiences through related clinics or cohort seminars, the outcome should be a powerful synthesis of knowledge and skills useful to practicing school leaders.

ISLLC Standards

A second set of standards (Interstate School Licensure Consortium), similar to those established for NCATE accreditation, was developed in the early 1990s and are in use in approximately 24 states. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) sponsored these standards so that the primary constituency is the state education agencies responsible for licensure (Hart and Pounder, 1999, p. 139). These are similar to the NCATE standards but specify achievement of the standards according to programs for principals and those to prepare superintendents. They use outcome-based measures with a strong emphasis on behaviors necessary to achieve a broad goal of educational success of all students (Hart & Pounder, 1999). The performance indicators require evidence of knowledge, skills, and dispositions for each of

the standards. CCSSO has contracted with the Education Testing Service (ETS) to develop a test to be used in assessing the standards. Currently that test is being piloted in several states.

The ISLLC Standards for School Leaders state:

> A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by: (1) facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community; (2) advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth; (3) ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; (4) collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources; (5) acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner; (6) understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (p. 10 quoted in Hart & Pounder, 1999, pp.139-140).

Recent Developments

Through the actions of the National Policy Board with representation from all the professional groups, a special committee was appointed to merge the two sets of standards. Final action is still pending on the final version of the standards. If the member organizations and the state education departments agree on one set of standards that specifies the knowledge, skills, and dispositions (attributes) to be the core of preparation programs for all educational leaders for whom licensure is required for jobs, the controversy over what the knowledge base should be may be resolved at least for the immediate future or moved to a different stage of conversation.

Both the NCATE and ISLLC standards are assessed by outcome or performance based evidence. It is hoped that by using what may to be more authentic measures of assessment, licensure will be more closely connected with effective administrative leadership. It is too early to know how many preparation programs have changed their course content and other instructional strategies to prepare their graduates for this different approach to licensure. Another implication of using performance-based assessment is the possibility of determining the effectiveness of preparation programs based on principals and superintendents' performance on the job.

Internship – Clinical Experiences

Second to the extended discussion about the Knowledge Base in importance to the preparation programs for educational leaders is the Internship or Clinical Experiences. The difference in approach seemed to reflect the contrasting views of the value of academic knowledge, the purview of the university and discipline oriented faculty, and the practical knowledge which can only be learned through experience "on the job" under the mentorship of an experienced administrator. Growing evidence in the 1980s and 1990s showed that to be an effective educational leader, part of the preparation had to be in the field. But this phase of the preparation program had to be more than the casual, hit or miss assignments of the past. The selection of the site, the mentor, and the time for reflection on the experience must be essential parts of the internship.

Before continuing with the other themes and illustrations of new or revised programs, a brief mention of the work of the Danforth Foundation is relevant because it provided real support

through its two major programs related to the preparation programs for educational leaders -- an important factor in change.

The Danforth Foundation

During the 1990s, the Danforth Foundation, with headquarters in St. Louis, established and funded two programs: The Preparation of School Principals and the Professors of Educational Administration. Because each program involved 15 to 20 different universities, change occurred in both masters and doctoral programs. In the Preparation of School Principals Program, the Foundation encouraged certain features at the universities, e.g., expanded candidates from ethnic minorities and women; curriculum that emphasized ethics, interpersonal relations, planning, speaking and writing; and especially internships with a team composed of university facilitator, site administrator, and a mentor (Milstein, 1993).

Examples of Innovative Programs (Some supported by the Danforth Foundation)

The Danforth Program for the Preparation of School Principals emphasized the clinical experience through a partnership between the university, the school district and the Foundation. Milstein wrote about some of these programs after five years of operation in Changing the Way We Prepare Educational Leaders. (1993). VanMeter summarized a second report on this program that was published in 1997 (1999, p. 154). Some of the following examples were part of this Danforth Program:

1. The University of Alabama faculty focused on survival skills and instructional leadership skills needed by entry-level administrators. Content is packaged in 2-hour modules and is presented during the summer. Faculty members are drawn from across the university, not from the field. Integrated seminars are held to help students synthesize the modules.

2. University of Central Florida kept its traditional course blocks but increased its use of simulations, case studies, role-playing, and reflective writing. In addition, dynamics at internship sites are being integrated into classroom discussion and a Renaissance strand, which gets students involved in a variety of artistic, cultural, and civic events, introduces students to alternative ideas and different cultures. Finally, student portfolios are used as part of their evaluation.

3. The University of Connecticut purposefully sequenced learning and engaged leading practitioners to team with professors to promote the blending of theory and experience. Learning modules are being developed and long-term field-based projects are being integrated in the academic program.

4. California State University at Fresno also sequenced academic offerings, which focus on instructional leadership and emphasize hands-on participative learning. Workshops designed and presented by students are offered for academic credit. Finally, an advisory committee, composed of leading administrators from the area, is retained to keep the academic content relevant. The program involves a strong collaboration with area superintendents. "CSU has conducted research that shows significant growth in perceived competencies between beginning and ending participants" (Kelley and Peterson, 2000, p. 29).

5. The University of Washington instituted curriculum design committees composed of faculty, administrators, students, and alumni to guide program development. A yearlong cohort-based program focusing on the development of moral leadership and organizational change, implementation and evaluation (Kelley & Peterson, 2000) Academic content is organized around

two major themes, which have replaced traditional courses; the moral dimensions of leadership and inquiry, and organizations and educational change. Topics explored are organized so that they parallel the cycle of activities being focused on in school districts (e.g., budget issues are discussed when school districts are working on annual budget presentations. Finally, academic meeting times are offered during the day rather than in the evening to increase the likelihood of effective learning (quoted in VanMeter, 1999, pp. 154-155).

6. East Tennessee State University was one of the original Danforth program sites. The program was designed to accommodate the work schedules of full time teachers. The cohort group meets in the summer and participates in five separate placements in a 540-hour internship. The curriculum is based on the ISLLC standards (Kelley and Peterson, 2000).

Programs with Changes but not part of the Danforth Foundation.

University of Louisville IDEAS Program. The University of Louisville program is not one of the Danforth supported programs but represents another example of an innovative program. "IDEAS (Identifying Educational Administrators for Schools) is a 9-credit cohort with traditional coursework and ongoing modules of field experience. The internship is part-time; students are recommended and sponsored by a principal with whom they work 8-10 hours/week... The curriculum is based on the ISLLC standards" (Kelley & Peterson, 2000, pp. 30-31).

Fordham University VIA Program. The VIA Program represents a revision of the Masters/ Professional Diploma program to prepare building and district office leaders (though not specifically superintendents). It is a partnership with New York City school districts and other districts in the metropolitan area whereby the districts make an initial identification of potential leaders, and if accepted, provide one-third of the cost plus a program fee. It is a sequenced, two-year cohort program offering courses and experiences that reflect the NCATE guidelines including a two-semester internship. Classes are held in four locations near the districts where the students work and staffed by full time faculty and adjuncts who are practicing administrators. A summer National Principals Institute and a Saturday Series on Critical Issues with nationally recognized speakers are part of the program (Fussarelli and Smith, 1999).

Characteristics of Selected Programs

The programs described in the article, "The Work of Principals and Their Preparation: Addressing Critical Needsfor the 21st Century " by Kelley and Peterson (2000) show the following characteristics that might be worth investigating for ideas for exceptional programs. The authors note, however, "that these programs tend to be more demanding of participants than traditional programs, and yet the programs are all in demand due to their reputation for producing highly qualified competent administrators and getting graduates placed in administrative positions" (p.37).

The differences in these select programs from more traditional ones include the selection and screening processes as well as the overall structure and content of the programs. Placement rates for graduates of these programs are also much higher. Other important features include coherence, curriculum focus, sequencing of courses, scheduling structure, collaboration with districts, and membership (p. 37) The programs were virtually all cohort based with 20-25 students. The cohort provided a support system and professional network. In many of the programs, courses were team-taught.

Each of the programs had a clear, well-defined curriculum focus. The curriculum was sequenced and mapped against the annual cycle of regular work responsibilities. In some of these programs, significant collaboration existed between the university and practitioner community in the region. Screening and selection were done in collaboration between the university and district personnel. The authors conclude that what may be difficult to replicate, "is the time and effort expended by the faculty and practitioner community to discuss, plan and agree upon a direction for the programs. Finally, it took the collaborative involvement of local districts with university faculty to make the program successful. Nonetheless, these programs demonstrate that changes can occur which significantly redefine what a preparation program can accomplish" (p. 39).

Milstein (1990) presents a clinical sequence called a developmental approach which "focuses on development of a foundation of the theoretical orientation, with expanding opportunities to apply and test these theories in reality based settings. More detail on this approach to clinical experience can be found in Educational Leadership in an Age of Reform (1990). The phases are Understanding the Context; Observing and Shadowing; Deductive Examination and Long Range Planning; Application; Evaluation; and Placement and Follow Up (pp. 123-129). This is only one example of a sequenced clinical experience that also includes time for reflection and learning.

Doctoral Degree Programs

Most of the programs described so far are Masters or Certification programs. Doctoral Programs were also revised or reinvented, prompting the continuation of the debate over the doctor of education (Ed.D.) and the doctor of philosophy (Ph.D.). McCarthy in her article, "The Evolution of Educational Leadership Preparation Programs," states "studies also have found little distinction in course offerings between Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees in educational leadership" (p. 125). Brief descriptions of several revised doctoral programs follow.

University of Kentucky - Multiple Perspectives. "Here, the inclusion of an enhanced 'multiple-perspective' orientation to the study of organizational and leadership issues was featured as one emphasis in the new curriculum. Students take a two-course sequence that incorporates a variation of the 'frames theory' approach popularized by Bolman and Dean (1984-1991)" (Van Meter, 1999, pp.157-9).

Hofstra University. "Beginning in fall, 1988, the Department began an overhaul of its preparation programs for school administrators followed by additional changes to the doctoral program" (Shakshaft, 1999, p. 238). The doctoral program is a cohort with students beginning with the certification program in the first two years. The doctoral only sequence begins with a year long, team taught course on doctoral work, methods of inquiry, and a general overview of the historical research of the field. The next two years are devoted to projects and research strands. Each course includes materials related to a range of race, gender, and class experiences. One goal was to recruit and retain a capable and diverse student body, which they believe they have achieved. The faculty is still concerned about how to evaluate and measure success, but continue to focus on these issues. The program reflects the new NCATE standards.

Fordham University. As part of the Danforth supported program for Professors of Educational Administration, the doctoral program was revised in the late 80's. It is a cohort program with a coherent sequence of courses planned over a two-year period including the two summers with the dissertation taking the next 2 to 4 years to complete the Ed.D. Additional credits are required for the Ph.D. In 1996, the Executive Leadership Program designed primarily for educational leaders in K-12 schools was merged with the Church Leadership Program, a 20

year partnership with the Graduate School of Religion and Religious Studies at Fordham. The current cohorts numbering from 12 to 18 have also included some students employed in higher education institutions. Many of these students select the Ph.D. degree as do some of the church leadership students especially our international students from Africa, Asia, India, and Australia. The completion rate has been remarkable with 80% completing in 4 to S years and holding high-level positions in many parts of the nation and the world. (Mulkeen and Cambron-McCabe, 1994 and recent information)

Miami University (Ohio). Miami University was also part of the Danforth Foundation Professors of Educational Administration Program in the second cycle. The program was based on the view that the practice of educational administration is an intellectual, moral, and craft endeavor. The doctoral program at Miami gave attention to development of intellectual, moral, and technical practice. A common core of course work focused on the intellectual aspect while critical reflection on present practices informed by theoretical knowledge was also included. A problem based teaching approach was used for the course work in the Doctoral sequence.

The emphasis in this program is summarized as follows:

> Accepting school leadership as an intellectual and moral practice requires educators to understand their role in shaping the purposes of schooling for a new era, and to understand how this cannot be detached from the broader social and political context. Educational administration faculty must now confront the construction of a knowledge base that permits these understandings if we are to educate transformative leaders (CambronMcCabe & Foster, 1994, p. 59).

Harvard University - Urban Superintendency. This program, begun in 1990, "is an intensive, rigorous program that prepares individuals for top leadership positions in city school systems" (http://gse.harvard.edu. 2001). A core group of 6 to 9 educators are selected each year for the program which has three components: 12 months of coursework in full time residency in Cambridge; a full time six month internship with a superintendent in an urban school district; and the research and writing of a dissertation. The courses in the first year are part of the HSGE's course sequence for the doctoral program. The dissertation can be completed on or off campus. Fellowships are provided for the first year; and a substantial stipend is offered for the second year internship. The program is looks for "educators who have a record of effectiveness in improving teaching and learning in urban public schools, and a demonstrated potential for exercising leadership to systematically raise student achievement." (http://gse.harvard.edu.) This program is different from many doctoral programs in the inclusion of a full time 6-month internship in a superintendent's office.

Superintendents Prepared

Unlike the other programs described so far, this is not a degree-granting program. In order to respond to the growing shortage of highly skilled, diverse populations to assume positions of leadership in our nation's urban/large school districts, an urban leadership development consortium of three Washington, DC based organizations -- The Institute for Educational Leadership, The Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, and The McKenzie Group, Inc.-- was created in 1991. The purpose was to respond to the growing shortage of highly skilled,. The one-year program includes a one-week institute to assess leadership strengths and weaknesses; individual leadership development plan; an on-going coach/mentoring relationship; on-site leadership observations of complex working environments; and a concluding institute to focus on additional educational issues. Eligibility requirements include a demonstrated

commitment to public education; record of senior level service; capacity for leadership; and currently employed in a senior position of responsibility. The program emphasizes the development of political and managerial skills, communications, community mobilization, and the leadership skills and perspectives required to implement state of the art educational strategies. Of the 106 individuals who have participated since the program began in 1992, approximately 40% have become first time urban superintendents (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001).

Other Programs

Several other doctoral programs were revised with practice based initiatives as a major focus. "These programs frequently sought to blend theory, research, and clinical experiences; included intensive summer seminars; relied on extended clinical weekend sessions; involved senior local administrators as clinical professors, and included on going research projects" (Hart & Pounder, 1999, p. 133).

Ed.D. and Ph.D. - A Reexamination

Many of the programs included a reexamination of the nature of the traditional dissertation associated with the Ph.D. required also for the Ed.D. "There was often a reconceptualization of the Ph.D. and reenergizing of the Ed.D. One outcome was an applied or clinical dissertation, refereed to as a clinical research project. This project placed greater emphasis on a specific problem of practice but the research would still include a review of theories and research on the topic" (Hart & Pounder, 1999, p. 134).

> Bridges and Hallinger (1995) offer this description of the Ed.D. Degree, which was: created to meet quite educationally different goals (from the Ph.D.) Where it is offered, the Ed.D. is intended to provide opportunities for practitioners to develop the capacity to apply knowledge from theory and research to problems of policy or practice. The creation of knowledge is not generally a stated goal of Ed.D. research, though the distinction is often fuzzy in practice...The career goal of Ed.D. recipients in educational administration generally remains within the sphere of practice. For many, the Ed.D. represents a stepping stone to a higher position as an educational administrator. Consequently, professional doctoral students tend to view dissertation research as an academic requirement for completing the doctorate, rather than as an experience that will have instrrumental value in their future work (p. 116).

Milstein (2000) in his critique of McCarthy's chapter in the *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (1999) comments on the same issue of the Ed.D. - one that has not been a major focus of the reform efforts of preparation programs. While he states that the limited number of faculty may be part of the reason,

> ...but it is also the result of our unwillingness to create and conduct programs that differ depending on career goals; that is, designing Ed.D. programs that enable practitioners to expand their knowledge and ability to be transformational leaders and designing Ph.D. programs that prepare individuals who intend to become researchers/professors or pursue similar careers as policy analysts and developers (p 542).

Finally, Bridges and Hallinger (1995) offer this suggestion for the Ed.D. dissertation:

> Graduates of Ed.D. programs in educational administration should be able to demonstrate their ability to apply appropriately research, theory and craft knowledge to problems arising from educational policy and/or practice. The Ed.D. dissertation represents an experience through which students can demonstrate their achievement of this goal (pp. 117-118).

Instructional Strategies – Problem-Based Learning

One approach developed by Edwin Bridges at Stanford and Philip Hallinger formerly at Vanderbilt University deserves mention even though it is not found currently as a part of most preparation programs. It addresses directly one of the issues faced by educational leaders, especially principals - the need to solve problems or to state the issue another way - the need to frame problems or problem find.

Bridges describes this approach by saying, "problem-based learning fundamentally changes the roles of students and instructors, and that questions about what students learn through this method have been only partially answered" (Hart & Pounder, 1999, p. 123). This approach differs from traditional courses and the case method in materials used and nature of activities of students and instructors. The proponents of problem-based learning argue that in addition to gaining mastery of problem finding that "students learn teamwork, administrative and project development skills, and problem solving" (Hart & Pounder, 1999, p. 12). Several books and reports are available with guidelines for using problem-based learning as part of preparation programs.

Integration of Technology

The integration of technology in administrative preparation programs is in the beginning stages. Several examples were found in the reports used for this paper - but since the developments in this field are moving rapidly including distance learning through the internet, more programs are in existence then are cited in this paper.

Wichita State University. In the doctoral program, two applications of technology are described (Gibson, 2001): "The first is that used as part of program functioning and required for daily use and program effectiveness. The second related to technology usage that is emerging, experimental, and evolutionary" (p. 207). In the instructional program, interactive technology is used. "This program has provided school leaders with the tools to think about technology in vastly different ways and the experience to do something about it when they return to their jobs as visionary school leaders capable of supporting the needs of twenty-first century learners" (p. 216).

Purdue University. The Ph.D. program in educational administration was redesigned to include a cohort model and added another feature of "offering the program via interactive video to deliver courses to students at remote sites. Hence, using a cohort model to enhance student support seemed especially important" (Hirth and McInerney, 2001, p. 233). The program has just started so there are no graduates as yet. This program offers a variety of features that would be helpful for others investigating the use of technology, especially the incorporation of distance learning in doctoral level programs.

Information Enviornment for School Leader Preparation (IESLP). This project of UCEA began in the 1990s and is still being refined. "IESLP required students to use technology to research, communicate, interpret, and present information. Through the Internet-based

environment, students used problem solving, collaboration, and group decision making to study the complexities of modern schools while developing the skills and practices related to successful school leadership" (Chance and Lee, 2001, p. 190). This innovative project combines technology with curriculum development for preparation of educational leaders. The development of the project over several years is detailed in the article by Chance and Lee in the NCPEA Yearbook (2001).

Leadership Framework

Sam Houston State University. Another instructional strategy devised at Sam Houston State University is the creation of a Leadership Framework. "Since 1992, the Leadership Framework has been our program's vehicle for introducing our students to formal reflection and for facilitating the habit of reflective thinking...It is our belief that educator preparation programs must acknowledge that in order to be effective,leaders must become reflective and that programs must provide prospective administrators with skills for reflection and with time for practice in reflection" (Brown, Irby, and Fisher, 2001, p. 126). The Framework includes: Philosophy of Education, Philosophy of Leadership, Vision for Learners, Vision for Teachers, Vision for the Organization, Vision for Professional Growth, and Methods of Vision Attainment. Students write their Framework and receive feedback from other students and faculty used for revisions. The final version becomes part of their portfolio.

University of Dayton. Four professors at the University of Dayton describe their experiences in teaching courses on Diversity - racial, ethnic, and gender. This issue was not addressed specifically in many of the programs described in this review. In commenting on the wide range of reactions to the course taught as part of their Masters program and the Principal Licensure program, "we've been both stunned and reassured by our students and by ourselves. We're convinced that these issues need center stage in our program. . Courses that deal with issues of diversity can create context for the entire program in preparing administrators. ...We wonder whether we as a faculty have committed ourselves to looking at our own attitudes and our own racism and sexism" (Ridenour, First, Lydon, and Partlow, 2001, p. 162).

Partnerships for Preparation Programs.

A series of articles in the *Journal of School Leadership* (November,1999) describe the challenges, opportunities, and obstacles to establishing partnerships as a way to redesign preparation programs for educational leadership. Barnett, Hall, Berg, and Camarena define cooperation, coordination, and collaboration. They provide a visual typology of partnerships between external resource system and school districts (p.497). They end by providing guiding principles for establishing and sustaining collaborative partnerships.

Scribner and Machell (1999) describe the Interorganizational Collaboration for a statewide doctoral program. This unusual collaboration involved a research university and five regional state universities. A cohort structure was unique in "that students participate as a closed group locally at their home institution where they complete course work each semester for two year" (p. 512). The case study of this collaboration provides suggestions for other institutions looking for new forms of partnerships.

Cohorts

A significant change in the past decade has been the use of cohort student groups for both masters and doctoral programs. McCarthy states that, "in 1995, the Center for the Study of

Preparation Programs reported that half of the UCEA units used cohorts at the master's level and 80% usedthem at the doctoral level" (1999, p. 128).

A comprehensive study of cohorts, conducted by Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, and Norris, is reported to Educational Administrative Quarterly, April, 2000. They detail the benefits, difficulties, and potential for use in preparation programs for educational leaders.

Student outcomes from earlier studies were confirmed: students' social and interpersonal relationships, program completion rates, cohesiveness, and professional networking are once again found to be important student outcomes" (Barnett, et al., 2000, p. 272). Other benefits that also parallel other studies were "how cohorts can positively impact faculty-student relationships, program efficiency, and the use of more innovative approaches such as team teaching and integrated curriculum" (p. 272). Some of the disadvantages were also described such as tension and adversarial relationships that can develop between students as well as between students and faculty; a shift in power relationships between students and faculty; and influence of a few dominant members. What was lacking and needs to be considered for the future is the impact of the cohort experience on future behavior in the workplace. Does the opportunity for interpersonal relations develop more effective ways to deal with staff in the workplace? What is the balance of support from the group and the competitiveness that is also present? With the increase in the use of cohorts, these are important questions to be addressed.

Faculty – Background and Change

In the review of new and revised programs, concern was expressed in a few of the continual lack of professors of minority groups or women. Few were found that present an explicit plan to change the present situation. McCarthy (1999) in her review in the *Handbook of Research of Educational Administration*, states that there has been a change in gender composition - between 1972 and 1994, the "percentage of women increased tenfold from 2% to 20%" (1999, p. 130). With this increase in the number of women faculty, it was assumed that more change would take place in attitudes and culture. McCarthy, however, states "This is somewhat disheartening for those who had expected new faculty, who are disproportionately women, to bring fresh perspectives to teaching and research in the field " (1999, p. 130).

No change comparable to that of women has been made in the number of faculty of color. "In 1994, only 11% of the educational leadership faculty members were people of color" (McCarthy, 1999, p. 130). She continues, "this finding is troublesome because racial diversity is essential among school leaders and those preparing them to effectively meet the challenges of the changing demographics in our nation's schools" (p. 130).

The other faculty issue that warrants attention is the balance between academic or discipline prepared faculty and practitioners. During the period when social science was the dominant philosophical basis for preparation programs, faculty from discipline or academic backgrounds dominated. In recent decades, attention has been given to hiring faculty with experience in schools especially for those programs with a field-based emphasis. The difficulty often arises with regard to the qualifications and experinences of former practitioners and the demands of the university for research and publications rather than work field-based efforts. One recommendation to this dilemma is an appropriate balance among expectations of the faculty and a change in the reward system of the university. Faculty promotion should be balanced to reflect the importance in the creation of new knowledge as well as working in field settings.

Ideal of Scholar Practitioner Leader Divergent Thinking as an Engine of Change

Two recent articles address the knowledge base and standards from another perspective. Jenlink (2001) outlines another view of leadership with an emphasis on scholar-practitioners, "who reflect the core values of social justice, caring, equity, and democratic through their leadership praxis...At a time when cultural diversity in America challenges us to change the social structures and cultural patterns of society, the need for a new ideal of educational leadership is nowhere more evident than in America's schools" (2001, p. 79). Burnett (2001) presents another view as he urges professors to exercise in the time of imposed standards and best practices to be used by all. He encourages academic freedom that he feels is being challenged by accountability proposals. "Educational leadership faculty have become viewed increasingly as trainers rather than educators of school leaders" (p. 113). He posits that divergent thinking can play a positive role.

Students – Recruitment and Quality

As with concerns about a more diverse faculty, the need for diverse, better-prepared students is also expressed. But as with the faculty, few reports or articles specify any plan for recruitment of a more diverse, quality student body. Several programs have worked with school districts to identify teachers with leadership potential and provide support during the program as well as assistance in placement. These collaborations show some promise for preparing people of color for their own districts, which should increase the available pool.

Keedy and Achilles (2001) provide some ideas for recruiting potential leaders for preparation programs. Several of the ideas include expanded use of distance learning; collaborations with districts and state departments; alternative certifications; reciprocal certification and portable retirements; review structure and content of preparation programs; and job attraction.

A second article by Creighton (2001) suggests that programs use other means of assessing students, specifically an audition to see how the potential leader would perform in a specific situation. He concludes that while not ignoring the traditional admission criteria, but

> We must discontinue the practice of admitting candidates to leadership preparation programs on the sole basis of the variety of non-behavior-based measures such as test scores, interviews, and letters of recommendation. These measures do not give us an estimate of how the candidate will interact with individuals and groups encountered on a daily basis at the school site. The audition process can help us assess candidates in situations calling for "inventiveness, spontaneity, and sensitivity (Sarason, 1999, p. 113)" (2001, p. 110).

Summary and Conclusions

From this selective review of new or revised preparation programs for educational leaders over the past 15 years since the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987), it would seem that change has taken place. But other commentators (McCarthy, 1999 and Hart & Pounder, 1999) in particular caution us is assessing the change. Recent studies characterize change as incremental rather than dramatic, falling short of comprehensive and radical reform. McCarthy states:

> Pohland and Carlson (1993) subsequently found incremental changes in educational leadership programs but little evidence of dramatic departures from traditional program components or delivery systems. Despite the sincere efforts of various reformers, some commentators contend that most leadership preparation programs remain in the 1990s much as they were a decade or even longer ago. (Duke, 1992; Thomson, 1993, 1999, p. 125).

Hart and Pounder in their review of a "Decade of Activity" (1999) come to similar conclusions. "Major program restructuring in universities, often described as practice-based and undertaken over the past decade, may not have been as common as many would wish" (1999, p. 134). They further comment on practice-based changes - one of the deficiencies cited in the Commission's 1987 report. "Far less common were changes in the structure of degree programs that might have significant implications for practice-based changes. Perhaps Norton's results demonstrated the perennial problem in discussions of reform -- that rhetoric about reform was more prevalent than real, lasting change" (1999, p. 134-5).

The most effective way to summarize the many studies and articles reviewed describing exceptional and innovative preparation programs for educational leaders is to look at the issues that emerged and relate them to the degree possible with the deficiencies and recommendations of the 1987 National Commission's report. These issues can also serve as Points of Discussion at the Conference.

Points for Discussion

1. Knowledge Base. This topic received much attention in the past 10 years; and with the establishment of the NCATE Curricculum Guidelines and the ISLLC Standards, this topic will continue to be at the top of the agenda for university preparation programs. Hart and Pounder (1999) take a similar view, "national and state organizations appeared to be moving forward in making substantive changes in licensure and certification requirements for school leaders that may force changes in preparation programs" (p.125). If the two sets of standards are merged as has been proposed by the National Policy Board, the potential impact will be even greater since the standards will become the basis for state certification and the entry to jobs. It will be important for those interested in preparation programs tocontinue to follow these developments and have a voice in the decisions.

2. Clinical Experience(Intership). Since Internship (ideally full time) is an integral part of both the NCATE and the ISLLC standards, this aspect of preparation programs will continue to receive attention. Questions about the nature of the internship, the tasks to be learned, the nature of the supervision, mentoring, placement, reflection, full or part time, and location (more than one site), are only some of the questions that need to be answered and a design developed so that the internship will provide the practice knowledge that is needed. Attention should also be given to the relation of the academic or theoretical knowledge learned in the courses and the application to the actual practice in the field.

3. Degrees. The Masters degree continues to be the major one for entry-level positions in school administration. Some of the programs have reviewed the content of these courses (e.g., the knowledge base) as well as sequence and coherence of the program. More effective research and assessment are still needed to see whether the content is in fact preparing leaders for the current demands of schools and society.

The question of the difference between the EdD and the PhD is still with us. More attention should be given to what makes the two degrees different and equally valid for positions in education – but different positions.

4. Instructional Strategies. The programs reviewed (and these were only those for which there was sufficient published materials to be included, did reveal a variety of new strategies being tried. As with most of the programs, too little assessment is available to know what the impact may be. Use of cohort groups is the most prevalent of the new approaches at both the masters and doctoral level. Problem-based learning is getting more and more attention with detailed guidelines for those programs that want to try this approach.

Since all agree that problem finding or framing is as critical a skill to develop as problem solving, this approach merits attention. Issues that did not appear as dominant in these programs as one would expect are those of social justice, equity, excellence, and equality. These are areas that warrant our serious attention especially in light of the changing demographics of our schools.

Technology is getting attention and with the rapid developments in this area, there is no question that the advances in technology can be integrated into preparation programs will have to be addressed. Distance learning is a connected topic, which is also getting more attention.

5. Students. The need to find more effective recruitment efforts to attract a more diversified student body is still with us. At the same time, the quality of the student body is another concern, which calls for creative plans. The identification by school districts of potential leaders is seen as one viable way to attract more students who can return to their own districts.

6. Faculty. As with the students, diversity among the faculty continues to be lacking especially ethnic and racial groups. The number of women faculty has increased measurably in the last 10 years. The need to find a balance between the academic or discipline oriented faculty and the practitioners continues to call for discussion and solution. Attention should also be given to the issue of life long learning and work with graduates for professional development once they complete their degree or certification programs.

References

Barnett, B. G, Bason, M. Yerkes, D., and Norris, C. (2000). Cohorts in Educational Leadership Programs: Benefits, Difficulties, and the Potential for Developing Leaders. *Educational Administration Quarterly, XXXVI* (2), 255-282.

Barnett, B.G., Hall, G.E.; Berg, J.H.; Camarena, M.M. (1999) A Typology of Partnerships for Promoting Innovation. *Journal of School Leadership, 9*(6), 484-510.

Bridges, E.M. (1992) *Problem Based Learning for Administrators*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Bridges, E.M and Hallinger, P. (1995) *Problem Based Learning in Leadership Development*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Brown, G., Irby, B.J., and Fisher, A. (2001). The Leadership Framework: Facilitating Reflection for 2lst Century Leaders. In T.J. Kowalski (Ed.), *21st Century Challenges for School Administrators* (pp. 126-134). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Burnett, E. (2001). Divergent Thinking as Evidence of Positive Change: The Role of Academic Freedom in the Educational Administration Professoriate. In T.J. Kowalski (Ed.), *21st Century Challenges for School Administrators* (pp. 113-125). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Chance, P. L. and Lee, K. (2001). Exploring Technology, Change, and Chaos Theory: Moving Educational Leadership Preparation Programs into the New Millennium. In T.J. Kowalski (Ed.), *21st Century Challenges for School Administrators* (pp. 189-202). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Creighton, T. (2001). Lessons from the Performing Arts: Can Auditioning Help Improve the Selection Process in University Administration Preparation Programs in the 21st Century. In T.J. Kowalski (Ed.), *21st Century Challenges for School Administrations* (pp. 101-112). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Donmoyer, R. (1999). The Continuing Quest for a Knowledge Base: 1976-1998. In J. Murphy and K. Seashore-Lewis (Eds.) *Handbook of Research in Educational Administration*. (pp. 25-43). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Donmoyer, R., Imber, J., and Scheurich, J. J. (Eds.) (1995). *The Knowledge Base in Educational Administration: Multiple Perspectives*. Albany, NY: The State University of New York Press.

Fusarelli, L.D. and Smith, L. (1999). Improving Urban Schools VIA Leadership: Preparing Administrators for the New Millennium. *Journal of School Leadership, 9*(6) 534-551.

Griffiths, D.E.; Stout, R.T. and Forsyth, P.B. (Eds.) (1988). *Leaders for America's Schools. The Report and Papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Gibson, I. W. (2001). Technology Standards and Reform in Educational Practice: The Role of Information Technology in the Transformation of a Leaders Preparation Program. In T. J. Kowalski (Ed.). *21st Century Challenges for School Administrators*. (pp. 203-220). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Hallinger, P.; Leithwood, K. and Murphy, J. (Eds.) (1993). *Cognitive Perspectives on Educational Leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Harvard Graduate School of Education (2001) *Administration: EdD, APSP, Urban Superintendency*. http://gse.harvard.edu.

Hart, A.W. and Pounder, D.G. (1999). Reinventing Preparation Programs: A Decade of Activity. In. J. Murphy and P. Forsyth (Eds.), *Educational Administration. A Decade of Reform*. (pp. 115-151). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hirth, M.A. and McInerney, W.D. (2001). Technological and Programmatic Challenges Confronted in Delivering a Distance Learning Doctoral Program. In T.J. Kowalski, (Ed.) *21st Century Challenges for School Administrators*. (pp. 233-242) Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Jacobson, S. L. and Conway, J. A. (Eds.) (1990). *Educational Leadership in an Age of Reform*. New York: Longman.

Jenlink, P.S. (2001). Beyond the Knowledge Base Controversy. Advancing the Ideal of Scholar-Practitioner Leadership. In T.J. Kowalski (Ed.) *21st Century Challenges for School Administrators*. (pp. 65-88) Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Keedy, J.L. and Achilles, C.M. (2001). The Intellectual Firepower Needed for Educational Administration's New Era of Enlightenment. In T.J. Kowalski (Ed.) *21st Century Challenges for School Administrators*. (pp. 89-100) Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Kelley, C. and Peterson, K. (June 15, 2000). *The Work of Principals and Their Preparation: Addressing Critical Needs for the 21st Century*. Unpublished paper.

Leithwood, K and Steinbach, R. (1995). *Expert Problem Solving: Evidence from School and District Leaders*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

McCarthy, M.M. (1999). The Evolution of Educational Leadership Preparation Programs. In J. Murphy and K. Seashore-Lewis (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (pp. 119-139) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Milstein, M.M. (1990). Rethinking the Clinical Aspects of Preparation Programs. From Theory to Practice. In S. L. Jacobson and J. A. Conway (Eds.). *Educational Leadership in an Age of Reform*. (pp. 119-130) New York: Longman.

Milstein, M.M. an Associates. (1993). *Changing the Way We Prepare Educational Leaders: The Danforth Experience*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Milstein, M.M. (1999). The Evolution of Educational Leadership Programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly XXXV* (4) 537-545.

Mulkeen, T. A., Cambron-McCabe, N., and Anderson, B.J. (Eds.) (1994). *Democratic Leadership: The Changing Context of Administrative Preparation*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Murphy, J. (1992). The Landscape of Leadership Preparation. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. and Forsyth, P.B. (Eds.). (1999). *Educational Administration: A Decade of Reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. and Seashore-Lewis, K. (Eds.) (1999) *Handbook of Research in Educational Administration*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ridenour, C. S., First, P.F., Lydon, A., and Partlow, M.C. (2001). Issues of Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Diversity in Preparing School Administrators. In T.J. Kowalski (Ed.) *21st Century Challenges for School Administrators*. (pp. 146-164). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Scribner, J. P. and Machell, J.R. (1999). Interorganizational Collaboration in a Statewide Doctoral Program: A Lesson in the Construction of Meaning. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(6) 511-5333.

Superintendents Prepared. *An Urban Leadership Development Consortium*. (2001). Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Thomson, S.D. (1999). Causing Change: The National Policy Board for Educational Administration.. In J. Murphy and PB. Forsyth (Eds.) *Educational Administration: A Decade of Reform* (pp. 93-114) Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.